DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 596 IR 009 714

AUTHOR Shrock, Sharon A.; And Others
TITLE Instructional Evaluation Techniques: Ends Dictate the Means.
PUB DATE 7 Apr 81
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (Philadelphia, PA, April 7, 1981). "Lecture Checklist" may not reproduce due to type size of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Check Lists; *Data Collection; *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; Lecture Method; Questionnaires; *Rating Scales; Tables (Data); *Teacher Evaluation; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses two separate studies undertaken in the same academic department to ascertain consistency in student evaluation ratings. Each study used Frey's Endeavor Instrument, a 7-item form that is specifically designed to solicit student input for administrative decision making, and the Southern Illinois University Instructor & Course Evaluation Form (ICE), an instructional evaluation form with 40 items clustered under four subscales: personal-interpersonal, course structure, course quality, and course difficulty. Conducted during the spring semester of 1980, the first study included 13 classes representing 11 different faculty members. The second study took place in the fall of 1980 and included 17 classes representing 11 different instructors. The results indicated that evaluations differed depending upon the instrument used. Copies of four additional instruments that were chosen to demonstrate the variety of observation recording devices available are also provided: (1) the Lecture Checklist and Student Response Record, (2) the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form, (3) the Majer-Flanigan Classroom Presentation Checklist, and (4) the Berquist and Phillips Forms. Three references are listed. (CHC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207596

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Instructional Evaluation Techniques: Ends Dictate the Means

Sharon A. Shrock
Assistant Professor

Jerry K. Stonewater
Assistant Professor

William C. Coscarelli
Associate Professor

Learning Resources Service
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
(618) 453-2258

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry K. Stonewater

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR009714

In his recent work, Frey (1978) has shown that traditional forms used in the evaluation of instruction are often heavily influenced by the professor's concern for students, friendliness, availability and helpfulness, encouragement of questions and discussion, and enthusiasm. In addition to these rapport-related items, the professor's pedagogical skill - ability to plan, organize, and conduct class, as well as the ability to influence student knowledge - is also measured on traditional evaluation instruments. However, the two factors are often not reported separately, resulting in scores that are often heavily influenced by the rapport dimension (see Frey, 1978 for a complete discussion). In short, pedagogy and rapport dimensions on traditional instructional evaluation instruments are often not independent measures. In fact, many of us have probably heard or said that student evaluations are "nothing more than popularity contests". The idea that these evaluations are not really measuring teaching ability form the basis for many discussions, grievances, and feelings of ill will among teachers. Further, when such evaluations are used to assess instructor effectiveness for purposes of promotion or tenure decisions, one enters into a debate between the pragmatic issues of administrative decision making and the ethereal realm of "good teaching". In this paper we will address some of the problems inherent in evaluating instruction, and indeed, the theme of this paper is this: <u>There is no one best way to evaluate instruction and instruments so used need to be selected with care</u>. In the first section of this paper we will illustrate the volatility of student evaluation instruments when one attempts to summarize the complex nature of teaching in a simplistic manner. Then, we will demonstrate the variety of instruments that exist for examining the teaching-learning process.

SECTION I

Two separate studies within the same department were undertaken to ascertain consistency in student evaluation ratings. In both studies, Frey's Endeavor Instrument and the local Instructor & Course Evaluation Form (ICE) were used.

The FREY Instrument

Frey's evaluation instrument is a seven-item form that is specifically designed to solicit student input for administrative decision making. The items are: 1) The student had to work hard in this course; 2) Each class period was carefully planned in advance; 3) Class discussion was welcome in this course; 4) The student was able to get personal help in this course; 5) The instructor presented the material clearly and summarized major points; 6) The grading accurately reflected student performance; and 7) This course has increased my knowledge and competence in this area. Students respond to these items on a strongly agree to strongly disagree scale.

Two summary scores are available when using the Frey: Pedagogical Skill (PS) and Rapport (R). These two scores represent the major dimensions measured by the Frey instrument and as such are independent, i.e., they measure two distinct aspects of one's teaching. (The correlation between the two factors is 0.17, indicating low overlap, which is desirous for independent measures. Also, they account for about 75 percent of the variance in scores, which is extremely high.) Each score is derived by computing the following formulas:

PS = 0.1 (item 1) + 0.4 (item 2) - 0.2 (item 3) + 0.3 (item 5) + 0.4 (item 7)

R = 0.2 (item 2) + 0.5 (item 3) + 0.5 (item 4) + 0.2 (item 6)

In general, PS can be thought of as measuring teaching skill, while R can be thought of as measuring the interpersonal dimension.

The Instructor and Course Evaluation (ICE) Instrument

The ICE is the standard, 40-item university form used to evaluate instruction.

Items cluster into four subscales: Personal-Interpersonal, Course Structure, Course Quality, and Course Difficulty. Means and deciles are reported for items within each cluster as well as an overall mean for each cluster. This instrument is similar to most university rating forms and thus provides some basis for generalization of results.

The Studies

The first study was conducted during Spring 1980 and included thirteen classes representing 11 different faculty members from the same department. Students filled out both the Frey and the ICE evaluation forms. An attempt was made to include professors at all ranks and to include varying sizes of classes, since various studies have shown that rank and class size affect evaluation results.

The second study was conducted during Fall 1980. Seventeen classes representing 11 different instructors were included. Again, students filled out both evaluation instruments.

Spring 1980 study. For the Spring 1980 study, the rank order correlation between rapport (R) and pedagogical skill (PS) is 0.19 on the Frey, indicating that the two dimensions are relatively independent for the sample under study. On the ICE, the personal-interpersonal factor is fairly well correlated with the other three ICE subscales: structure, quality and difficulty, indicating that the 4 subscales tend to be dependent, i.e. they tend in the direction of measuring the same construct. Thus, rapport does not influence the pedagogical measure of teaching when the Frey is used, while the personal-interpersonal influences all other measures on the ICE, i.e. it cannot be parcelled into a unique measure. Further, the personal-interpersonal subscale on the ICE correlates 0.68 with rapport on the Frey. Thus, rapport and personal-interpersonal tend to measure the same thing. Hence, we conclude that the rapport-like dimension called personal-interpersonal on the ICE influences all subscales and is a contaminating

factor throughout the instrument. (See Table 1). Additionally, by the Frey, faculty were rank ordered differently on R and PS (see Table 2); their correlation was 0.19. Particularly note the individual who was ranked 13th on PS and 1st on R. For the ICE, however, faculty rank orders on the four subscales are similar. This is verified by the fact that 5 of the 6 correlations of rank order for the ICE are 0.52 or greater, indicating similarity in ranks. Thus, if an instructor were being evaluated for promotion or other matters requiring administrative decision-making, the decision made using this data might be radically different if one focused on a rapport dimension to the exclusion of the skill dimension. Further, as was seen in Table 2, the ICE which purports to separate out skill and rapport factors may not be doing so. Thus, two radically different decisions may result depending on the instrument used and in this case both of these instruments have been commonly accepted as measures of teaching effectiveness!

Fall 1980 Study. Similar conclusions can be drawn for the Fall 1980 study, though the results are not so dramatic as with the Spring, 1980, study. (Table 3). Here, however, PS and R correlated much higher--0.52--indicating that there was much more similarity in rank ordering of the faculty on the two factors. Again, the rapport dimension from the Frey instrument correlated very highly with the Personal-Interpersonal subscale on the ICE (0.82). However, the personal-interpersonal also correlated very highly with the three other factors on the ICE. With "structure," particularly, the correlation was almost perfect (0.94). (Table 4).

It would appear that finding a consistent measure of instructional effectiveness is, at best, a difficult task. By using two common instructor rating instruments we have seen that very different decisions can be reached. The volatility of these results leaves us in a precarious position when dealing with administrative decisions. It is perhaps best to conclude that indeed, there is probably no one best instrument to evaluate instruction. We would be reluctant to defend either

Table 1

FREY RANK ORDER

Instructor	Rank by PS	Rank by R
1	8	10
2	11	11
3	2	6
4	10	8
5	4	5
6	12	13
7	5	4
8	6	3
9	9	12
10	3	7
11	7	2
12	13	1
13	1	9

Table 2

Comparison of Two Instructional

Evaluation Forms - Sp 80

(Spearman Rank Correlations)

		Frey's Endeavor Instructional Rating System		Instructor and Course Evaluation			
		Pedagogical Skill	Rapport	Personal-Interpersonal	Structure	Quality	Difficulty
Frey's Endeavor Instructional Rating System	Pedagogical Skill		.19	.33	.51	.78	.27
	Rapport			.68	.06	.32	.17
Instructor and Course Evaluation	Personal-Interpersonal				.68	.62	.63
	Structure					.52	.66
	Quality						.33
	Difficulty						

For more information, contact Dr.'s Sharon Shrock, Jerry Stonewater, or William Coscarelli, Learning Resources, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

Table 3

FREY RANK ORDER

Instructor	Rank by PS	Rank by R
1	10	12
2	13	13
3	7	11
4	3	5
5	2	7
6	14	17
7	11	9
8	12	14
9	4	10
10	8	16
11	15	15
12	16	6
13	9	4
14	17	8
15	1	1
16	5	3
17	6	2

Table 4

Comparison of Two Instructional Evaluation Forms - Fall 80

(Spearman Rank Correlations)

		Frey's Endeavor Instructional Rating System		Instructor and Course Evaluation			
		Pedagogical Skill	Rapport	Personal-Interpersonal	Structure	Quality	Difficulty
Frey's Endavor Instructional Rating System	Pedagogical Skill	1	.52	.68	.65	.78	.27
	Rapport		1	.82	.62	.32	.17
Instructor and Course Evaluation	Personal-Interpersonal			1	.94	.62	.63
	Structure				1	.52	.66
	Quality						.33
	Difficulty						

For more information, contact Dr.'s Sharon Shrock, Jerry Stonewater, or William Coscarelli, Learning Resources, Learning Resources, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

of these approaches in a court of law, and in an increasingly litigious society, this is more than a moot point. Rather, we would argue that instruction can be critiqued in a meaningful way but that instruments that are intended for diagnostic purposes, e.g. the ICE, ought to be used as such, not as administrative tools. With this caveat, we can now look at a range of observation instruments that illustrate a variety of approaches to assessing instructor effectiveness in the classroom.

SECTION II

Ideally, a unique instrument would be created for each evaluation situation taking into account the specific purposes of instruction. Even the cafeteria style, choose-your-own-item questionnaire provides minimal flexibility compared to what would be present in the ideal evaluation plan. While student evaluation data is useful as one component of a diagnostic evaluation, the addition of observation data by a trained and sensitive observer is recommended. Furthermore, most student questionnaires are too skeletal as recording devices to exploit the rich data found in an observation; specially designed instruments are more suitable for this purpose.

The instruments that follow were chosen to demonstrate the variety that exists in observation recording devices. The following procedures vary along a continuum of structure--from the highly structured, specific purpose form to the totally unimposed structure of observation log techniques. The selection included is by no means exhaustive, and is offered primarily to heighten the reader's awareness of diversity among techniques and consequently the need to select wisely among them.

The Lecture Checklist and Student Response Record

These two forms were designed to be used together. The Lecture Checklist is intended for use by a formal observer of a lecture: the Student Response Record is designed to collect student opinion about a given lecture. The forms are specific to lecturing and would not be useful for evaluating other instructional strategies. The Lecture Checklist helps the observer focus on specific aspects of the lecturer's behavior and yields information in far greater detail than that of most teaching checklists. The Student Response Record is intended to assist students in critical evaluation of the lecture by focusing their attention on what went on in their heads while the instructor spoke rather than seeking their opinion of undefined abstractions such as "organization", "clarity", "interest", etc. The student instrument is short and simple to complete in recognition of the difficulty of getting students to attend seriously to time-consuming questionnaires.

© Sharon A. Shrock, 1980

THE LECTURE CHECKLIST

Familiarize yourself with the items below before observing a lecturer. During the observed lecture, decide whether each of these behaviors does or does not occur. Record in the blank spaces to the right the specific behaviors you observe that support your decision regarding each of the following items.

Yes No The Lecturer...

GENERATES INTERESTS

___ ___ ...prepares students attitudinally for the lecture that is to follow.

(gives a demonstration, provides an analogy, asks a leading or thought-provoking question, etc.)

ORGANIZATION

___ ___ ...introduces the lecture, i.e., provides students with an understanding of what the lecture will cover.

(provides an outline, a verbal overview, list of objectives, etc.)

___ ___ ...adapts content to student backgrounds.

(gives examples from a variety of fields, cultures, socio-economic classes, etc., if appropriate to content; prior knowledge and experience of students as well as their general ability level are considered.)

___ ___ ...makes clear distinctions between the major and minor points within the lecture.

___ ___ ...makes smooth transitions from topic to topic within the lecture.

___ ___ ...at appropriate points during the lecture, summarizes the points that have been made.

2

Yes No CLARITY

___ ___ ...uses language appropriate for his students.

(defines new terms carefully, avoids unnecessary jargon, esoteric language, unorthodox word usage, etc.)

___ ___ ...avoids misleading or distracting information.

(eliminates unnecessary conflicting information, unnecessary detail, potentially confusing remarks or examples, etc.)

___ ___ ...illustrates general information and abstract concepts with good examples.

(includes non-examples, distinguishes between similar concepts, etc.)

___ ___ ...emphasizes practical application of the material where appropriate.

___ ___ ...repeats important information often to correct for temporary lapses in student attention.

SEEKS FEEDBACK

___ ___ ...checks with students to assure that complex material is being understood.

(is alert to students' non-verbal behavior, solicits feedback regarding comprehension from the entire group rather than focusing on a few of the most responsive students, etc.)

___ ___ ...engages the students by asking questions.

(asks questions requiring upper-level cognitive processes--analysis, application, evaluation--as opposed to low-level, recall questions.)

Yes No

___ ___ ...provides adequate opportunity for students to ask questions.

(uses good judgment in allocating time to lecture and interaction; makes arrangements to answer student questions individually if necessary.)

___ ___ ...is alert to students wishing to ask questions.

___ ___ ...repeats student questions so that the entire group can interpret the answer or subsequent discussion.

___ ___ ...answers students questions directly and efficiently.

(doesn't allow a question to develop into a disruptive digression; doesn't use obfuscation to avoid answering a question, etc.)

___ ___ ...speaks to the entire group.

(doesn't lecture to just a few students or consistently lecture to one side of the room.)

PACING

___ ___ ...paces the lecture according to the listening and note-taking skills of the students.

___ ___ ...allows adequate 'silent time' for students to think and/or to write information down in their own words.

4

Yes No

___ ___ ...doesn't lecture longer than 20-30 minutes without a break.

(intersperses lecture with discussion, "think time," student activity, etc.; delivers more than one lecture in a class period.)

PRESENCE

___ ___ ...establishes rapport with the students.

(is approachable, interested in students and their learning, likable, etc.)

___ ___ ...is comfortable before the group.

(does not exhibit nervous mannerisms; encourages students to feel relaxed; is not defensive; does not discourage interaction, etc.)

___ ___ ...varies the pitch and tone of his voice.

(speaks with conviction, interest, enthusiasm, etc.)

___ ___ ...seems to enjoy giving the lecture.

___ ___ ...is clearly audible.

(makes certain that students in the rear of the room can hear.)

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

___ ___ ...uses blackboard effectively.

(writes legibly; doesn't stand in front of his board work, talk facing the board, or spend excessive time "writing out" portions of the lecture.)

Yes No

___ ___ ...uses appropriate visual aids effectively.

(doesn't attempt to draw complex diagrams on the blackboard; leaves projected visuals on the screen long enough for comprehension; makes effective use of color, motion, etc.; makes certain all visuals can be clearly seen by those in the rear of the room.)

___ ___ ...provides handouts to cover complex diagrams, detailed lists, supporting information, etc. when appropriate.

___ ___ ...ensures that the classroom physical environment is comfortable and conducive to learning.

(low noise level, adequate ventilation, sufficient yet nonglaring light, reasonably comfortable seating, a room with adequate acoustics, etc.)

CLOSURE

___ ___ ...facilitates psychological closure at the end of the lecture.

(is clearly finished rather than in the midst of a hurried explanation; provides a final summary of the material.)

___ ___ ...makes reference to the next class meeting, drawing the relationship between the just completed lecture and the subsequent class activity or following lecture.

___ ___ ...is in control of class dismissal.

(finishes on time; does not subtly cue students that class is over before his communication with them is completed.)

© Sharon A. Shrock, 1980

THE STUDENT RESPONSE RECORD

Read each of the following items completely and decide which of the four statements most accurately describes your reaction to the lecture you just heard; try not to let other aspects of the course influence your responses to these items. Circle the number of your choice. Space is provided after each item for you to make more specific comments. Please add any information that you think will improve the quality of the lectures in this course.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LECTURE

4 Exceptionally well done; the introduction gave me a framework that helped me to organize and understand the information that followed.

3 Adequately introduced; I was able to relate most of the information in the lecture to the instructor's introductory remarks.

2 Attempted but poorly done; I wasn't sure what the topic (s) of today's lecture was until after several minutes had passed.

1 I don't remember hearing an introduction to this lecture; the instructor just seemed to 'start in'.

ORGANIZATION

4 Excellent; I know the major points made during the lecture and was able to follow the instructor easily as he went from one to the other.

3 Not bad; I was able to follow the lecture from minute to minute, but its overall organization was not apparent to me.

2 Not good; at times the various topics or points made within the lecture didn't seem to be related.

1 Poorly done; I had real difficulty figuring out how the pieces of information presented in the lecture were related to one another.

CLARITY

4 Exceptional; I understood everything the instructor said.

3 Adequate; I think I understood the major points of the lecture.

2 Not good; I think I missed a few important points during the lecture.

1 Poor; I really couldn't make sense of most of it.

INTEREST LEVEL

4 I found myself truly interested in the lecture.

3 I was marginally interested in the lecture; the instructor had my attention most of the time.

2 My attitude toward the lecture was neutral—I could 'take it or leave it.'

1 I was bored by the lecture; I really had to make an effort to prevent my mind from wandering.

PACE OF DELIVERY

4 Just right; I was able to follow the lecture comfortably and could take notes easily.

3 A little too fast, but the pace did not interfere with my comprehension of the material.

2 Too fast to understand every point thoroughly.

1 A big problem; I found myself straining to keep up and frequently leaving gaps in my notes.

____ Please check here if, on the other hand, you think the lecturer's pace was too slow rather than any of the above.

AUDIBILITY

4 Perfect; I could hear everything that the instructor and other students said.

3 I could hear everything the instructor said, but not the questions and comments of other students.

2 Not very good; sometimes I couldn't hear the instructor.

1 Very bad; I really missed a lot because I couldn't hear what was going on.

VISUALS

4 Used exceptionally well; I could see the blackboard work and/or other visuals clearly, and they helped me understand the material covered in the lecture.

3 Not enough; the visuals that were used were helpful, but there were places in the lecture where visuals should have been used and were not.

2 The visuals used could be clearly seen but were poorly designed (confusing) and, therefore, not very helpful.

1 The visuals used and/or the blackboard work could not be seen or read.

MANNERISMS

4 Exceptional poise; the lecturer is comfortable before the group, uses gestures effectively, has no physical (staring at the floor, repetitive motions, etc.) or verbal ("uh", etc.) nervous habits.

3 Adequate delivery style; the lecturer has no physical or verbal nervous habits.

2 The lecturer has some nervous mannerisms, but they do no interfere with my comprehension.

1 The lecturer's nervous mannerisms are so extreme that I was distracted from the lecture.

If you circled 2 or 1 above, please describe the problem more specifically below.

SUMMARY/CLOSURE

4 Very well done; the instructor summarized the lecture in a way that will help me remember it.

3 Fairly well done; the instructor at least touched on the main points again before dismissing class.

2 Attempted but not well done; hurried and/or delivered while students were preparing to leave the room.

1 I don't recall any summary of the lecture at all; the instructor just stopped when the time was up.

USEFULNESS OF THE LECTURE

4 Extremely useful lecture; I'm sure I will be able to apply what I learned today.

3 Of some value; I will be able to apply at least part of what I learned today.

2 Of limited value; I won't be able to use much of the material covered in this lecture.

1 A waste of my time.

Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form

The Tuckman scale was created by Bruce Wayne Tuckman (1976) to assess "the unique human quality of teaching" (p. 342). It uses a semantic differential technique to assess an instructor on four factors - Creativity, Dynamism (dominance and energy), Organized Demeanor (organization and control), and Warmth and Acceptance. Tuckman suggests that the instructors being evaluated first complete the form in accordance with their ideals; they can then compare the subsequent ratings of observers and/or students with their original judgements of how they would like to appear.

The instrument is highly structured, yielding a numerical score in each dimension. Unlike many other teacher observation instruments, the Tuckman scale focuses on what might be called the personality that the instructor projects to the group.

Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (TTFF)

Teacher observed _____ Observer _____ Date _____

Place an X in that one space of the seven between each adjective pair that best indicates your perception of the teacher's behavior. The closer you place your X toward one adjective or the other, the better you think that adjective describes the teacher.

1.	ORIGINAL	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	CONVENTIONAL
2.	PATIENT	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	IMPATIENT
3.	COLD	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	WARM
4.	HOSTILE	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	AMIABLE
5.	CREATIVE	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	ROUTINIZED
6.	INHIBITED	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	UNINHIBITED
7.	ICONOCLASTIC	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	RITUALISTIC
8.	GENTLE	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	HARSH
9.	UNFAIR	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	FAIR
10.	CAPRICIOUS	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	PURPOSEFUL
11.	CAUTIOUS	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	EXPERIMENTING
12.	DISORGANIZED	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	ORGANIZED
13.	UNFRIENDLY	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	SOCIABLE
14.	RESOURCEFUL	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	UNCERTAIN
15.	RESERVED	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	OUTSPOKEN
16.	IMAGINATIVE	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	EXACTING
17.	ERRATIC	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	SYSTEMATIC
18.	AGGRESSIVE	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	PASSIVE
19.	ACCEPTING (people)	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	CRITICAL
20.	QUIET	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	BUBBLY
21.	OUTGOING	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	WITHDRAWN
22.	IN CONTROL	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	ON THE RUN
23.	FLIGHTY	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	CONSCIENTIOUS
24.	DOMINANT	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	SUBMISSIVE
25.	OBSERVANT	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	PREOCCUPIED
26.	INTROVERTED	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	EXTROVERTED
27.	ASSERTIVE	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	SOFT-SPOKEN
28.	TIMID	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	_____,	ADVENTUROUS

Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form Summary Sheet

Person observed _____ Observer _____ Date _____

A. Item Scoring

I. Under the last set of dashes on the sheet of 28 items, write the numbers 7-6-5-4-3-2-1. This will give a number value to each of the seven spaces between the 28 pairs of adjectives.

II. Determine the number value for the first pair, Original-Conventional. Write it into the formula given below on the appropriate line under Item 1.

For example, if you place an X on the first dash next to "Original" in Item 1, then write the number 7 on the dash under Item 1 in the summary formula below.

III. Do the same for each of the 28 items. Plug each value into the formula.

IV. Compute the score for each of the four dimensions in the summary formula.

B. Summary Formula and Score for the Four Dimensions

I. Creativity

Item (1 + 5 + 7 + 16) - (6 + 11 + 28) + 18
(__ + __ + __ + __) - (__ + __ + __) + 18 = _____

II. Dynamism (dominance and energy)

Item (18 + 21 + 24 + 27) - (15 + 20 + 26) + 18
(__ + __ + __ + __) - (__ + __ + __) + 18 = _____

III. Organized Demeanor (organization and control)

Item (14 + 22 + 25) - (10 + 12 + 17 + 23) + 26
(__ + __ + __) - (__ + __ + __ + __) + 26 = _____

IV. Warmth and Acceptance

Item (2 + 8 + 19) - (3 + 4 + 9 + 13) + 26
(__ + __ + __) - (__ + __ + __ + __) + 26 = _____

The Majer-Flanigan Classroom Presentation Checklist

This instrument is somewhat more broad in scope - focusing the observer's attention on a diversity of general teacher behaviors. It is still, however, fairly high in structure, incorporating the Flanders style of time-interval based observation. The instrument is particularly useful for relatively inexperienced observers, allowing them some discretion in recording while guiding their attention selectively.

The Majer - Flanigan

Classroom Presentation Checklist

Directions: During the entire class period the observer should monitor who is dominating the discussion. Simply check T (teacher) or S (student) as appropriate for who did the most talking during that minute. Note that all observations may not be appropriate to the purpose of every class. These should be circled NA for "not appropriate." Also note there are not necessarily correct answers to the observations. IMPORTANT: (1) Do not attempt to comprehend the content of the class presentation during the observation. Observations can be made accurately and completely without comprehending the substantive content. (2) Keep a watch on your desk during the observation period. Begin each minute of observation with the second hand at 12 and keep a constant eye on the watch (not on a clock on the wall which can be distracting to the teacher and the students). If the teacher is talking at the beginning of the minute and is still talking after 30 seconds, check "T" for that minute and spend the remainder of the minute making observations. (3) Check off observations where they are numbered as you note them. This will aid your visual reference to unrecorded observations later in the period. (4) The blank line following each observation is to provide space for additional comments about particular observations.

Min.	Who's Talking?	Check After Observation Made	OBSERVATIONS	
1	T S	1	Teacher allowed time at the beginning to allow the students to "tune in to the topic"_____	yes no NA
2	T S			
3	T S			
4	T S			
5	T S			
6	T S	2	Teacher looks at students when talking to them _____	yes no NA
7	T S			
8	T S			
9	T S	3	Teacher has distracting mannerisms (looks down, covers mouth, paces nervously, erratic movements)_____	yes no NA
10	T S			
11	T S			
12	T S			
13	T S			
14	T S	4	Teacher directs student questions to other students for answers _____	yes no NA
15	T S			
16	T S			
17	T S			
18	T S	5	Teacher always has answer _____	yes no NA
19	T S			
20	T S			
21	T S	6	Teacher appears to have a need to comment and expand student questions and answers _____	yes no NA
22	T S			
23	T S			
24	T S			
25	T S			
26	T S	7	Teacher is boring _____	yes no NA
27	T S			
28	T S			

(continued)

Min.	Who's Talking?	Check After Observation Made	OBSERVATIONS	
29	T S	8	Teacher praises, smiles, rewards__	yes no NA
30	T S		_____	
31	T S			
32	T S	9	Teacher asks questions he does not	yes no NA
33	T S		know the answer to _____	
34	T S		_____	
35	T S			
36	T S	10	Teacher explains well _____	yes no NA
37	T S		_____	
38	T S			
39	T S	11	Teacher summarizes major points __	yes no NA
40	T S		_____	
41	T S			
42	T S	12	Teacher identifies what's important	yes no NA
43	T S		_____	
44	T S			
45	T S	13	Teacher appears aware of students	yes no NA
46	T S		(bored, want to ask questions, etc.)	
47	T S		_____	
48	T S			
49	T S	14	Teacher is energetic_____	yes no NA
50	T S			
51	T S	15	Teacher provides examples _____	yes no NA
52	T S		_____	
53	T S			
54	T S	16	Teacher allows student examples____	yes no NA
55	T S		_____	
		17	Teacher interrupts students _____	yes no NA
			_____	
		18	Teacher talks too fast_____	yes no NA
		19	Students appear to want to talk all	yes no NA
			at once (enthusiastic)_____	
			_____	
		20	Teacher allows time for student	yes no NA
			questions_____	
			_____	
		21	Teacher changes voice, intonation__	yes no NA
			_____	
		22	Teacher seems to be enjoying self__	yes no NA
			_____	
		23	Teacher allows silent "think time"	yes no NA
			_____	

(continued)

Check After Observation Made	OBSERVATIONS	
24	Teacher questions demand further thinking (higher levels)_____	yes no NA
25	Teacher pairs, groups students ___	yes no NA
26	Teacher gives students responsibility for conducting class _____	yes no NA
27	Teacher uses A.V. equipment (well)	yes no NA
28	Teacher seems well informed _____	yes no NA
29	Teacher is organized_____	yes no NA

Berquist and Phillips Forms

These instruments taken from Berquist and Phillips (1975) provide minimal structure to classroom observation. They are extremely useful in heightening the observer's awareness of instructionally useful behaviors before entering the classroom. During the actual observation period, the observer is left relatively free to record the conduct of the class in the spaces provided below each general behavior category.

Experienced observers seem to prefer more loosely structured devices such as these Berquist and Phillips forms. Indeed, some thoroughly experienced observers use no instruments at all, preferring to keep a continuous log of teacher and student classroom behavior that is later shared with the instructor in great detail.

OBSERVATION OF PRESENTATION SKILLS

SET INDUCTION: Set induction is more than an introduction; it is the preparation of a class for the learning which is to follow, often through an analogy, a demonstration, or a leading or provoking question. Examples: a lecture on British attitudes toward the American Revolution might begin with an analogy drawn from the Vietnam War; a chemistry class might begin with a spectacular demonstration of the process to be studied that period; a discussion of genetic differences between the sexes might begin with a vote on the class's attitudes towards the Women's Liberation Movement.

INTRODUCTION: This is the presentation, usually in a factual and objective manner, of an over-view of the material, activities, goals, and objectives planned for the particular class period.

ORGANIZATION: This is the ability of the instructor to present the material of the class in a clear and logical manner. Effective organization is usually characterized by a clear introduction, smooth transitions from topic to topic, clear distinctions between major and minor topics, occasional summaries, and clear outlines.

STIMULUS VARIATION: This is the ability to vary the pattern of instruction, which includes such elements as the instructor's movement around the classroom, his gestures, his voice level, and his ability to draw attention to important points.

VISUAL AIDS: These may include everything from the instructor's use of the blackboard to audio and video recordings.

CLOSURE: Closure is a way of summarizing and integrating the major points of a lecture, demonstration, or class discussion. It acts as a link between the familiar and the new and provides students with a sense of completeness and achievement.

OTHER COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS:

OBSERVATION OF QUESTIONING SKILLS

LOWER ORDER QUESTIONS: These questions generally have a "right" answer; they require the student to recall specific information and respond in a direct, factual manner.

HIGHER ORDER QUESTIONS: This questioning skill requires a student to go beyond a factual or descriptive statement. The student must generalize, relate facts in meaningful patterns, and compare and contrast concepts or make inferences.

PROBING QUESTIONS: These are specific questions an instructor uses in response to perhaps superficial answers or statements from students. Skillful probing requires that students go beyond a one-word response. These techniques help the student to explore and develop his own ideas and answers.

FREQUENCY: How frequently did the instructor ask questions? Did the questions come at particular points in the class or were they part of the broader presentation? How many questions were higher order questions? Lower order? Probing?

OTHER COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS:

OBSERVATION OF INSTRUCTOR'S ABILITY TO INCREASE STUDENT PARTICIPATION

VERBAL REINFORCEMENT: Instructors who reinforce student responses experience increased student participation. Look for various examples of positive verbal reinforcement: words like "Fine," "Good," and "Excellent" and phrases that indicate interest in the student's ideas, such as "Can you tell us more about that?" or "That's very interesting. How did you arrive at that conclusion?"

SILENCE AND NON-VERBAL CUES: Facial cues (smiles, frowns, a serious or puzzled look), body movements (like moving toward the student), head movements (nods and so forth), and gestures (pointing to a particular student or from student to student) all are ways an instructor can use non-verbal messages to direct a class discussion without intruding on it himself. Even silence can be creative. To what extent does the instructor use non-verbal cues in leading the class discussion?

RECOGNIZING ATTENDING BEHAVIOR: When an instructor becomes sensitive to the various verbal and non-verbal messages students send that indicate their level of interest, comprehension, and involvement, he is in a position to effect changes in their attention. First, does the class appear to be attending to the instructor or are there instances of such non-attending behavior as restlessness, random conversation among the students, reading material not part of the class work, or even sleeping? Second, does the instructor seem aware of significant non-attending behavior? Does he change the pace of his lecture as the result of restlessness, maintain eye contact with the class, or call on specific students who may not be paying attention? Does he ask the class about their sense of what he has said if they appear confused? If the non-attending behavior becomes widespread, does he confront the issue more directly?

OTHER COMMENTS:

Reference List

Bergquist, W. & Phillips, S. A handbook for faculty development. Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Frey, P. A two dimensional analysis of student ratings of instruction. Research in Higher Education, 1978, 9, 69-91.

Tuckman, B. Feedback and the change process. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 341-344.